

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 21, 2006.

Claims 12, 25 and 62-70 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12, 25 and 62-70. The present Response cancels claim 12 and amends claims 25 and 62-67, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 25 and 62-70. Claims 68-70 have not been amended but do depend from an amended independent claims. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### **The Present Invention**

Danknick deals with the fairly narrow problem of establishing a communication session between a work station and a printer peripheral. In contrast, the present invention deals with the problem of representing common entities as documents so as to extend the document-centric model of computing to physical and virtual entities. By bringing these entities into the sphere of electronic documents, existing tools and general purpose applications that understand and manipulate documents may be used to interact with the various entities. In essence, electronic documents become a metaphor for the interactive objects in both the virtual and the physical worlds, rather than simply a metaphor for physical documents. Danknick, with its more narrow focus on creating a single communication session, does not deliver these broader benefits.

Thus, the present invention is directed to a much different problem than is Danknick.

The Section 112 Rejection Made in Paragraphs Six and Seven of the Office Action Is Incorrect.

In paragraphs six and seven of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 25 and 62-70 under section 112, second paragraph based on a lack of antecedent basis for the limitation “the bit provider” in claim 25. Applicants have now merged claim 12 into claim 25 arguably mooted this rejection. However, the former base claim 12 **did** in fact recite the presence of “a bit provider”, supplying a proper antecedent basis for the limitation of “the bit provider” in claim 25. So the Examiner’s rejection is incorrect.

The Examiner’s Rejection of Former Claim 12

Claim 12 has been merged into the currently amended claim 25, arguably mooted the Examiner’s rejection of claim 12. However, applicants would like to make two points concerning the Examiner’s rejection of claim 12. First, in paragraph 12 the Examiner points out that in applicants’ arguments it is stated that the “active properties have executable code” whereas the claim recites the presence of an active property “having associated executable code”. There is new claim language in the currently amended claim 25 into which the limitations of former claim 12 have been merged. The new claim language reads: “an active property **incorporating** executable code”. So “incorporating” has replaced “having associated” in response to the Examiner’s remarks.

Second, in claim 12 the properties derive from the claimed data source. In the rejection the Examiner cites to an “applet” mentioned in column 7 of Danknick in conjunction with the discussion of Figure 10. However, this applet is “downloaded from the HTTP server.” (Col. 7, ln. 16). This arrangement is different from the claimed invention. In

the claimed invention the properties derive from the data source and, in Danknick, as the Examiner argues, it is the SNMP agent which most nearly corresponds to the data source of the claim. Thus, there is a difference between the former claim 12 and Danknick because the applet is downloaded from the HTTP server, not the SNMP agent per se, which agent most nearly corresponds to the data source of the claim.

#### The Examiner's Rejection of Claim 25

Claim 25 calls for the bit provider to "receive additional content information **from the application** via the application interface". (Emphasis added). There is an inconsistency in the Examiner's arguments as they appear, for example, at the bottom of page six and the top of page seven in the Office Action. The Examiner writes as follows: "The Examiner disagrees, because Danknick teaches inputting a request for a web page into an icon displayed on a browser, and sending the request to a copier for retrieving setting information **from the copier** over a network *—receiving and sending additional information from the application via a communications path—*." (Emphasis added). As the Examiner describes, in Danknick the "additional content information" (if any) comes from the copier, **not from the application** (which best corresponds to the Danknick browser and certainly does not correspond to the SNMP agent on the Danknick copier) as claimed in the present invention. As acknowledged in the Examiner's own words, then, there is an important difference between claim 25 and Danknick. In Danknick the browser window may be analogous to the claimed "application interface", but the "additional content information" (if any) comes from the SNMP agent on the copier (which most nearly corresponds to the data source of the claim), not from the "application" (which most nearly corresponds to the browser).

Another point is that the portion of the Danknick specification cited by the Examiner does not actually discuss the generation of "additional content information". The Danknick specification merely says that "the page 150 contains icons 151 which, when selected, cause administrative functions to be executed within the copier." (Col. 7, ll. 18-20). The Danknick specification does not say that selecting the icons causes the generation or transmission of "additional content information" by the copier.

Last, in the claim 25 rejection the Examiner analogizes the SNMP agent to the "bit provider" whereas in the claim 12 rejection the SNMP agent is the data source, not the bit provider. The bit provider is plainly different from the data source; the SNMP agent cannot simultaneously be reasonably analogized to both the data source and the bit provider.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Date: 5/24/06

Respectfully submitted,

By: Eric N. Hoover  
Eric N. Hoover  
Reg. No. 37,355

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800